

# SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

## MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

March 6, 2003

Natural Resources Building  
Olympia, Washington

---

### ***SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:***

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
Jim Peters	Olympia
Sara LaBorde	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Ed Manary	Designee, Conservation Commission

---

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Bill Ruckelshaus opened the regular meeting at 9:40 a.m.

The agenda was approved as presented.

### **Topic #1: Management and Status Reports**

Approval of Minutes: Steve Tharinger moved to approve the January 2003 Meeting Minutes as presented. Jim Peters seconded the motion. Minutes were approved as presented.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if a subcommittee had been formed to work on watershed budget issues, as mentioned in the January 2003 meeting minutes. Director Laura Johnson reported that Steve Meyer and staff of the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) have been working with the Council of Regions on the regional planning process but it is still in the early working stage.

### Management Status Reports:

#### ***Director's Report***

Director Johnson reported that the next meeting will be a funding meeting in Wenatchee on May 1 and 2.

Since the last meeting, the federal government has finalized its budget. The state of Washington will receive, through SRFB, \$28 million of the overall \$90 million appropriation for federal fiscal year 2003 to the four northwest states. Unable to report the net amount available for SRFB projects since there will be some restrictions on the money. Meeting on March 28 with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to work on joint performance measures to use when reporting to Congress.

The Puget Sound Shared Strategy group had a very successful conference in February.

Bruce Crawford is continuing to work on monitoring issues, such as the effectiveness monitoring, for the SRFB. He is also working to coordinate monitoring with other states and federal agencies.

### ***Financial Report***

Debra Wilhelmi presented this agenda item. (See notebook for details.)

The first draft of the legislative budget should be released March 24. The governor's budget was adjusted concerning the Office of the Interagency Committee (IAC) -- the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) grant program was moved from the Department of Natural Resources to IAC and \$5 million of 2004 federal funds was transferred from capital budget to operating budget for lead entity and regional board activities.

Ms. Wilhelmi highlighted several reports included in the notebook and mentioned the WWRP Project List for Fiscal Year 2004, which is available in the office of the IAC.

Several presentations on PRISM have been given to interested organizations, including Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF). If more agencies used PRISM, the result could be better coordination in tracking data.

There was discussion on federal funds available for FY04. Staff estimates the SRFB should receive between \$13.5-\$23.0 million. In the past, the Board has funded a little over \$24 million per cycle.

Brenda McMurray asked staff to follow-up with the Department of Ecology to determine what process they are using for the balance of funds for the In-Stream Flow agreement.

### ***Project Status Report and 4<sup>th</sup> Round Update***

Rollie Geppert provided a project management status update. (See notebook for details.)

To date, SRFB has funded 623 projects with 38% closed and completed.

Brian Abbott and Mike Ramsey gave a PowerPoint presentation of completed projects: Capitol Land Trust (#01-1235C); South Puget Sound SEG (#01-1239R and #00-1145R); Willapa Bay RFEG (#01-1227R); Hood Canal SEG (#00-1802R); Clallam Conservation District (#00-1821R); and Snohomish County Conservation District (#00-1779R).

Four Technical Panel members (Pat Klavas, Scott Nicolai, Kate Terrell, and Steve Toth) reported their experiences on the panel.

Pat Klavas has been involved in working with the fish passage review. Feels this was a great experience and was helpful to see the bigger picture.

This was Scott Nicolai's first year on the panel. He noted that in the past he questioned the value of the Technical Panel but now sees the benefit in having a separate state review of the projects.

Kate Terrell reported that there isn't enough time to interact with the lead entities. During the 3<sup>rd</sup> Round process the Technical Panel toured the project sites, which she found very helpful.

Steve Toth felt it would be better to have more time with lead entity groups, especially during strategy development.

Director Johnson noted that there will be a follow-up workshop with lead entities in May.

The Board expressed their thanks and gratitude to all the members of the Technical Panel for their tremendous efforts.

### ***Legislative Report***

Jim Fox provided the Board with a legislative update. March 5 was the cut-off date for all bills to get out of the policy committee of origin.

Senate Bill 5289 was amended in committee March 5. The substitute bill would adopt the Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy and charge the SRFB with implementation of that bill, including coordinating state agencies and establishing a monitoring policy implementation committee to assist the Board with its duties. The bill is scheduled to go to the Ways and Means Committee.

Larry Cassidy asked if the original monitoring bill would have created a new statewide board for overseeing monitoring and evaluation. Mr. Fox explained that the original bill recommended that an independent monitoring council be established which would have put responsibility for implementation of the monitoring strategy on the SRFB. The substitute bill provides for the Board to set up a separate monitoring policy advisory committee to the SRFB, consisting of five state agency representatives and five citizens with the chair appointed by the SRFB.

Mr. Cassidy asked where the money would come from for monitoring and evaluation, if SSB 5289 were to pass. Mr. Fox responded that the bill is not tied to an appropriation, however there is \$500,000 in the Governor's budget for the same types of activities.

Senate Bill 5518 would require legislative action and county commissioner approval on any proposed state agency land acquisition over five acres.

House Bill 1336, dealing with implementation of watershed plans, would require lead entities to consult with planning units on projects and prohibit the SRFB from funding projects that had not completed this process.

Director Johnson will continue to gather information on land purchase issues and provide this to the SRFB, as well as the IAC.

***Project Changes Report***

There were no changes.

**Topic #2: Governor's Salmon Recovery Office Report**

Steve Meyer reported on this agenda item. GSRO's primary focus at this time has been on legislative issues. He has been meeting with representatives to discuss salmon recovery programs and budget issues.

The Independent Science Panel (ISP) continues to work on stormwater issues. ISP is reviewing Ecology's new stormwater guidelines, and its report should be out sometime in May or June.

Had a meeting with the BPA on March 5 to discuss funding. The BPA is finding it difficult to fund new projects with no reserves on which to draw.

Met with Regional Fish Enhancement Groups (RFEs) concerning the Governor's budget. The RFEs feel strongly that the funds should stay with WDFW, and the Governor has agreed.

Funding of regional boards will be a challenge for the SRFB. The GSRO is offering its assistance to the SRFB to help work on guidelines and policies for funding the regional boards. Plans to bring an update before the Board in June.

Chair Ruckelshaus wants to make sure the SRFB knows what the regional boards will need to meet their goals and what those goals will be.

Brenda McMurray asked who is working on the regional issues. Director Johnson responded that she, Debra Wilhelmi, and Jim Fox are working on this, with possible additional help in the spring. Chris Drivdahl is working on regional issues for the GSRO.

Ms. Johnson feels it is important to find out what the roles, responsibilities and expectations are of the regional boards. Not just looking at the numbers, but at the products and where they fit in with policy issues for regional recovery planning. The plan is to bring the results of their work to the June Board meeting, with possible updates in May.

The current regional board funding contracts expire on June 30, 2003.

**Topic #3: Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) Report**

Jay Watson presented this agenda item to the Board. He updated the Board on where the Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) is on their vision statement.

A LEAG subcommittee has studied the comments from the SRFB and feel that the most critical and timely issue to focus on is the role of the Technical Panel. Mr. Watson noted that Technical Panel expectations, with regard to strategies and implementation, are

different from the way the locals view them. He also said there are two paths for the Panel: 1) have more project review time; or, 2) have more strategy review time. Strategies will be worked on at a conference in May with lead entity and Technical Panel members, along with a SRFB representative. This steering committee hopes to present suggestions for SRFB policy making to the Board at the June or July meeting.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked what role LEAG will play in developing the materials for this conference. Jay Watson responded that IAC and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) staff will be working on that.

Chair Ruckelshaus supports the work of the steering committee. He also made the point that lead entities do not have the authority to "implement" a strategy.

Craig Partridge would like to see some examples of the strategy problems brought to the Board. He specifically asked Mr. Watson to identify detailed differences between the SRFB Technical Panel and the TAGs regarding strategies.

Sara LaBorde thanked Mr. Watson for focusing on the strategy issue. She believes the conference will be the beginning of a three or four step process.

The Board discussed strategies and how they should be developed and used.

Chair Ruckelshaus suggested Brenda McMurray serve on the subcommittee to design the strategy workshop.

#### **Topic #4: Effectiveness Monitoring**

Bruce Crawford provided the Board with an update on effectiveness monitoring. (See notebook for details.)

Mr. Crawford has been working to develop three technical teams (Fish, Freshwater Habitat, and Marine Estuarine) to help create the design and sampling regime for the pre- and post-project sampling necessary for monitoring effectiveness. The newly-created Effectiveness Monitoring Policy Group (EMPG) plans to work toward developing common categories and performance measures for SRFB, NWPCC/BPA and Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) projects. The EMPG will also work on ways to coordinate monitoring information with other agencies and entities.

Bruce Crawford plans to present the effectiveness monitoring criteria for fish passage to the Board for review in June or July.

Chair Ruckelshaus would like the monitoring criteria to include how much of an impact the project makes.

Mr. Crawford attended a meeting on March 4 with Pacific Northwest scientists involved in validation monitoring. He felt this was the first step in developing a list of candidate watersheds in a collaborative approach to determine possible impact of SRFB projects.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if the results from validation monitoring in an intensively monitored watershed would be of any value to other watershed projects. Mr. Crawford explained that, while there are varying opinions on this subject, it is generally believed that if certain projects had demonstrated success in a controlled environment, similar results could be expected elsewhere.

#### **Topic #6: Policies for Funding Programs and Activities**

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook for details.) SRFB staff suggest the Board formally adopt the policies at the June meeting by incorporating them into the Board's strategy.

Mr. Fox reviewed the memo and discussed the timeline and next steps for a pilot programmatic funding cycle for programs aimed at coordination of assessment and restoration activities across multiple lead entity areas.

Jim Peters asked what would happen if two different groups compete for the same project since a letter of support is needed from the lead entity? Jim Fox replied that this would be one of the lessons that would be learned in the pilot project.

In regards to Attachment II, Larry Cassidy asked why the SRFB should add another layer since many counties have ESA coordinators for this type of coordination work.

Brenda McMurray asked Laura Johnson to provide the reality for getting good projects in the next two months. Ms. Johnson explained that there are already a couple of proposals submitted to staff. Jim Fox discussed three existing requests: NFWF small grants; NW Straits Commission and ghost nets; WDFW and index watershed monitoring.

Ms. McMurray would prefer to act on an ad hoc basis until the Fifth Grant Round. Feels it would be better not to ask groups to submit less developed projects, but give more time for them to prepare well-developed and thought-out projects.

Resolution #2003-03 was not acted on at this time, however the SRFB did approve proceeding using methods and process contained in this memorandum. The SRFB will revisit this at its June meeting.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if there was a reason to have concurrent timelines for both the lead entity projects and the 25<sup>th</sup> list. Mr. Fox responded that it would be helpful for the Board to know how much money is available for both types of projects which would come through the Technical Panel for deliberation at the same time as the lead entity projects.

#### **Topic #5: Fifth Round Process Update**

Director Johnson presented this agenda item. (See memo in notebook for details.) Staff will be working with over 50 local people who have volunteered to assist in preparing options for the SRFB to consider in June and July. Status briefings will be presented to the SRFB at its scheduled meetings in May and June.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

---

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

---

Date

Future Meetings:            May 1 & 2, 2003  
                                     Red Lion Hotel  
                                     Wenatchee, WA